Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0764MA-1 for North Brookfield Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant is proposing a six-component approach consisting of:

1) Project management and continuation of capacity-building for the philosophy of personalization begun under their state's Race to the Top (RTTT) reforms

2) Development of ELA Curriculum competencies

3) Development of math curriculum competencies

4) Blended learning involving digital learning and immersive learning environments

5) K-12 College and career readiness

6) Leveraging established relationships with public and private agencies to provide more extensive personalization (for the competitive preference priority)

Much of this appears to involve a continuation and expansion of the reforms the LEA began under their state's RTTT reforms. Personalization of curricula for students at all grade levels and improvements in student growth are the major goals that unite the six components listed above.

The vision statement listed numerous components and programs, and it was detailed. It wasn't always clear how reforms such as blended learning, school to college or career programs, and competency based systems, were going to bring about proposal's stated outcomes of improved ELA proficiency, improved mathematics proficiency, and English Language growth, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates. The collection of goals wasn't organized around a central goal or theory of systemic change within the district. In addition, many of the goals relied on a top-down implementation; as such it wasn't always clear how well the administrative goals would generate changes in teachers' implementations or students' learning outcomes.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has detailed plans to implement its proposed reforms. The proposal included a timeline, and a "Core Assurance Mapping Matrix," and a "[LEA]-Wide Reform & Change Planning Table" that gave a schedule of implementation, key steps toward meeting its goals within the four core educational assurance areas, "responsible parties" for ensuring that the goals are met.

a) All schools in the consortium will participate in the grant activities.

b) The specific schools were listed.

c) A total for 2145 students are enrolled at all of the consortium's schools; 40% are from low-income families.

The LEA details which students will be served and details its goal areas for each subgroup, and its plans for reaching those goals.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA's goals centered around improved ELA proficiency, improved mathematics proficiency, and English Language growth, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates, including for low income students, "high needs" students, and students with disabilities. To this end, the LEA planned to create Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), improve professional development, and to create summer institutes to train teachers in specialized areas. The goals were all data-driven, and the activities for meeting the goals were forms of professional development, such as PLCs, that many schools in many districts are already doing. Since the proposal involved scaling up current reforms to make them district-wide, they can't scale up beyond the participating schools. There is no discussion of a logic model or a theory of change. Outcome goals and reform measures are in line with RTTT goals, but there is not a more specific discussion of making deeper, district-wide changes in response to specific and identified needs of students.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA's plan involved having test scores, and graduation rates go up about 1-3% for each subgroup for each goal area. It provided a chart stipulating that achievement gaps for high needs students, low-income students, and students with disabilities would go down about 1% each year. College enrollment rates were provided as a baseline, but there are no goals charted for future years.

While the LEA described plans to increase Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), faculty training, to continue and expand its the reforms that began under its state's RTTT reforms, and improve summer training, the LEA didn't explain how these plans would help it meet the goals described above.

But overall, the LEA did explain and justify why it had chosen modest goals to reach its higher-need populations.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**12**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A) The LEA provided data demonstrating that between 2009 and 2012, its percentages of students scoring in the "advanced" and "proficient" category have usually increased in all tested grade levels and subject areas, while its percentages of students scoring in the "needs improvement" category have generally decreased. Although the number of students in the "failing" category has significantly decreased among the Grade 10 students, the number of students in the "warning" category for students in grades 3, 5, 7 & 8 has stayed relatively stagnant or slightly gone up. But the numbers of students in the "failing/warning" category was consistently low, and some fluctuation may be expected among very small subgroups.

The LEA reported that high school graduation rates have increased from 73.6% to 90.6% and from 54.7% to 77.5%, respectively, at its two high schools. College admission rates were not reported, and no goals were discussed.

b) The districts in the consortium do not have any persistently low-achieving schools or low-performing schools, but they did provide evidence of having subpopulations that were not making achievement targets, and that required better services, particularly when compared to districts from surrounding areas. Currently, the LEA's schools have made some modest gains and some losses in ELA and mathematics.

The LEA described its uses of the IPASS (or similar) data system to implement its RTI process.

c) The LEA described its uses of the IPASS (or similar) data system to provide personalized data and student information to students, parents, and educators. Students and parents have access to homework and grades in real time. Parents could be notified of attendance, student progress, check activities, and request extra help after school.

While the district has clear goals to raise test scores and facilitate data availability and communication, and while the LEA has won several grants to expand some of its educational programming, there is not articulation of how these goals and actions fit into district-wide goals for LEA-wide reform.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	**5**	**3**

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA described its uses of the IPASS (or similar) data system to provide personalized data and student information to students, parents, and educators. Students and parents have access to homework and grades in real time. Parents can be notified of attendance, student progress, check activities, and request extra help after school.

a –d) Actual personnel salaries for all school-level instructional and support staff, including those for instructional staff only [b], for teachers only [c], and for non-personnel expenditures [d] are made public through the Annual Town Report, and are made available to the general public. Both school district also host annual budget hearings. There was no evidence that the district had alternate means of making school level expenditures public for those who could not attend the annual meetings or go to the town clerk for that information.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA provided detailed information about meeting the state mandates for minimum days and hours for each type of school for each school year. Apart from that, they stated that the districts have "demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under Massachusetts legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in this proposal." No further information was given.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA provided extensive evidence of stakeholder engagement and support, including: district goal settings, dozens of meetings with constituencies within the town and district, vision setting among constituencies within the town and district, enlisting staff support, student support, and community support. Families were engaged by both members of the consortium through meetings with the PTO, athletic boosters club, Youth Center, School Committee, other committees, and through "neighborhood meetings." In addition, new programs such as cooperative cross-country and track teams, and Criminal Justice classes developed in conjunction with a local community college, have engendered support from students and the community. Finally, the community has shown support by raising money in order to keep its music and arts program, and toward maintaining their athletic programs when those budgets were cut. The LEA also provides numerous letters of support from various community organizations.

Principals, teachers, and other school staff were engaged through various staff meetings, local teacher's union meetings, and professional development activities. The only evidence provided of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools was mention of meeting with one of the local teacher's unions. There was not a letter of support from the teacher's union [a i].

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The analysis of needs and gaps consisted primarily of an analysis of infrastructure and faculty development needs, such as: building faculty capacity through professional development; improved curriculum development to align ELA and math curricula with the Common Core standards; and improved technology infrastructure. The applicant referenced that these improvements would help personalize learning environments, but didn't discuss how they would do so. Analysis of needs and gaps seemed to be more focused on the districts' administrative needs than on an analysis of student needs beyond the need to raise test scores.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA's PRIME (Personalizing Responsibility Involving My Education) Project proposed to "create structures that engage each learner in the development of individualized learning goals aligned with the Common Core Curriculum." They envisioned that the process may involve more "formative assessments to show students which grade-level expectancies they have mastered" for younger students. For older students, the process may involve "assisting the student to develop a plan with individualized student-negotiated goals, for demonstrating the mastery of required skills." The proposal then described the

implementation of the MassCore Graduation requirements; these types of college-readiness requirements have been in place in some states since the 80's. The LEA described some flexibility in the standards implementation, such as allowing some students to "test out" of individual courses, or to meet with a teacher during a summer to prepare for an AP test. The LEA also described how partnerships with local community colleges would allow some students to begin to earn college credit. The LEA planned frequent college and career counseling to help students achieve their goals. It also planned to build staffed Learning Labs in each of its schools that would focus on inquiry-based teaching practices, and which would promote their plans to create a "comprehensive college and career readiness curriculum." Finally, both high schools would like to expand their international student exchange programs.

While the LEA clearly had some concrete plans in place, it was hard to know how those plans would fully help it realize its goal of a fully personalized curriculum based on mastery of Common Core standards [b i]. Moreover, it was hard to know how these programs would lead to improved learning outcomes for all students. These programs seemed like they could take steps to help student identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards and help student structure their learning to achieve their goals [a ii]. The Learning Centers seem to be focused on helping students become involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest [a iii], but since there would only one Learning Lab in each school, it was unclear how heavily those would impact teachers' daily practices or students' daily learning. The proposal didn't clearly explain how such programs would lead to the fully student-owned curriculum proposed in criteria a i, iv, and v.

The proposal described implementing personalized learning sequences [b i], an increased variety of instructional approaches such as: increased access to pre-A.P. and A.P. curricula and project-based strategies implemented through the learning centers [b ii], and increased "access to high-quality digital learning content" [b iii]. These were often described or listed in table form without a full description of what they would look like for students or how they would be implemented.

There is little description of ongoing, regular feedback including frequently updated individual student data, although a computer system that makes such data available was described in a previous section [iv A]. Similarly, there was little description of personalized learning recommendations [iv B], apart from the plans to have them. Plans to use these resources in an RTI process were described in an earlier section [v], but are not discussed in this section. The proposal did not describe mechanisms to provide training and support to students to ensure that they would know how to use the new resources [c].

Overall, the plan proposed most of the elements that are stipulated in the RTTT application, but in some cases it listed them without into going into depth about how those plans will be integrated into a coherent vision or how they will impact each student's learning.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant had a detailed timeline for teacher professional training that would focus on social media and other technologies, Common Core Curriculum competencies, strategies for engaging students, and strategies for establishing personal learning networks [a i, & ii]. It also included plans to utilize the state's systems for tiered student support and evaluation of students and for teacher evaluation [a iii & iv]. These measures would take steps to ensure that all participating educators have access to technology tools, and learning resources [b ii] and to data that will help them generate actionable information about students' learning needs [b i, c i].

The proposal focused on implementing reforms that seemed likely to be already part of the state's reforms, plus proposed adding new technologies and faculty training. While the applicant stated that these reforms would help the schools in the LEA structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and that accelerates student progress, it was not clear how the reforms would accomplish this goal, or how they would allow students to pursue common and individual tasks toward meeting college and career-readiness standards [c].

The applicant planned to use the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation System to evaluate teachers, and has set targets for increasing the numbers of highly-effective teachers, as defined by the state [d], but it didn't explain how it wouldreach its increased targets except through its professional development and identification of highly-effective teachers to become teacher leaders.

Overall, the proposal seemed to focus on changes to district programs and teacher training. As such, planning seemed to center on administrative changes rather than on more thoroughly identifying and responding to student needs.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. The LEA has strong central supports from both of its superintendents and their governance structures.
b. The consortium plans to implement consistency in scheduling math blocks, and in sharing some support staff such as math and ELA coaches. But they plan to allow each district and school to maintain their autonomy in terms of scheduling.
c. The LEA stated that it plans to give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on independent mastery, but it didn't expand on how these plans will be implemented.
d. The LEA stated that it plans to give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways, but it didn't expand on how these plans would be implemented.
e. The LEA stated that its schools are already fully-inclusive, and that they essentially planned to extend their inclusive policies and Student Individual Development Plans to their mainstream population.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA highlighted the availability of technology at school, and the extended uses of its technology availability in after-school programs. It noted the importance of maintaining available technologies at school, particularly in a rural area. The LEA also agreed to "examine the feasibility of giving parents access through [a state program] to their child's electronic academic records such as transcripts by 2017." It also agreed "to examine the utilization of The Learning Registry."

While the LEA had some plans in place to ensure that all participating students, parents, and educators have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources, it seemed focused on keeping those resources and technical support focused at the school, and on "examining the feasibility" of making data available online for families that could not easily visit the school [a & b]. Similarly, plans to use information technology systems that would allow parents and students to export or import information in an open data format were left to several years in the future [c]. The schools already were using an interoperability framework within their schools [d]. Particularly given that the LEA is in a rural area, it is a concern that the LEA was leaving plans to make information available in multiple forms, and on multiple platforms, to the more distant future.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided customized flow charts that articulated its general process for ensuring continuous improvement. The process seemed to be primarily administrative, with processes to train faculty, assess progress, and refine goals. In the next section, the applicant stated it would provide a web page, which will be updated weekly, which will "display continuous and ongoing information concerning all aspects of the project."   It isn't clear where the teachers or students will become a focal part of this process.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The organizational chart demonstrated how different coaches and administrators would communicate with each other. The LEA also planned to have "vertical" meetings for articulation among administrators, project managers, and curriculum coaches, and weekly "horizontal" meetings for coaches and curriculum consultants in the content areas. The consultants, in turn, would organize and supervise professional learning communities (PLCs) at all sites. There LEA also plans to support teacher learning cohorts both within their buildings and via larger online communities among all sites. While the proposal recognizes that communication and buy-in are crucial to getting teachers to actually implement the policies, the communication and engagement structure is based on a top-down model of organizational structure. It isn't clear how this structure will bring about the desired change in teachers' "mindsets" from test preparation to facilitating student mastery in an individualized fashion.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has 8 performance measures, rather than the required 12-14. It includes a chart that explains its rationale for selecting the measure [a], how the measure will provide show whether personalized learning environments improve student achievement in that area [b], and how it will review the measure over time [c]. The applicant provides all the required performance measure data for each applicable population.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA presented a chart that included its goals, performance indicators, types of data, data collection scheduled, data collection method, and instruments to gather data. But its listings were often general, such as "competencies will be aggregated and stored on-line," or "analysis of data: qualitative." It wasn't clear specifically what types of information would be generated or how they would generate continuous improvement.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget identified all sources of funding [a, c i]. Their budget was extensive, detailed, and clearly delineated the amounts each partner gets for each of the consortium's described goals [b]. It provided a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities, including identifying which funds would be used for one-time investments and which would be used for ongoing operational costs [c ii].

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA made a great effort to ensure that it could maintain the sustainability of the RTTT investments. In many places, it included plans to start with a high initial investment to get a program going, and then have each district incrementally absorb the operating costs into its own budget. In other places, it detailed plans to use state funding when RTTT funding ran out.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1 & 2) The LEA described sustainable partnerships that are aligned with specific goals, including: a) Getting a Coordinated Family and Community Engagement Grant (CFCE) that allowed its schools to offer parent/child play groups and family based literacy events in order to ensure that its kindergartners entered school with specifically-defined school readiness skills. b) The LEA worked with a youth center in order to provide academic assistance tutoring for K-6 students in order to ensure that all third-grade students exited third grade at reading level. The LEA further planned to develop c) a mentoring program for its high school freshmen, d) implement a business and financial literacy curriculum at its high school, and e) work with local governments to create a Civic Engagement curriculum in its middle and high schools which would be integrated with the proposed learning labs. The goals of pursuing c, d, & e are to ensure that students graduate from high school on time and that they graduate with college and career readiness.

3) The LEA detailed plans to track and measure its selected indicators [a], and to scale their model to include a broader number and range of participants [c]. There is less information about how it will use its data to target resources to improve results [b] over time [d].

4) The LEA reiterated that these partnerships will integrate education and other services to address students' needs, but it

doesn't provide as much specific information on how these goals will be realized.

5 a-e) The LEA described how staff in participating schools would have the opportunities to participate in events created by these partnerships, attend meetings evaluating the partnerships' progress, and participate in opportunities created by partnerships developed with the Learning Centers, but it didn't seem to integrate staff beyond these fairly nominal forms of participation. It didn't go beyond reiterating its "vertical" and "horizontal" meeting structure to assess how the needs and assets of participating students are aligned with the partnerships' goals, or to identify how the needs and assets of the school community are aligned with the partnerships' goals. Its decision-making process aligns with the meeting and evaluation structures in place to evaluate their grant progress, but there isn't evidence of creating deeper methods for engaging in program evaluation and development beyond participation in programs and at meetings.

6) The LEA identified clear, ambitious yet achievable performance measures for each of its goals.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The LEA met this priority by stating its intent to align each aspect of its "Project Prime" with each aspect described here. Each of the core educational assurance areas was referenced in each section.

Total	**210**	**159**

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0764MA-2 for North Brookfield Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A Quaboag Valley Education Consortium (QVEC) comprised of two rural LEAs, North Brookfield Public Schools and Palmer Public Schools, articulates a comprehensive, coherent, and credible vision to accelerate student achievement, deepen learning, and ensure college and career readiness for all students through personalized education and support "grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests." The vision grows out of and builds on the work that the partner LEAs are engaging in spurred by participation in the State Race to the Top competition and additional State-based and district reforms that address the core educational areas.

The LEAs have already committed to increasing each year the percentage of students completing rigorous programs of study, on-time graduation and college enrollment. They are building data systems to inform instruction and they have begun to implement high-leverage improvement strategies, such as project-based learning and extended learning time, coordinating the use of funds from multiple sources (local, federal and State). The Consortium proposed new efforts and the expansion of existing ones for the Project, but it is unclear whether which, if any, specific target goals will increase as well.

The Consortium calls this grant project PRIME (Personalizing Responsibility Involving My Education) and identifies six

components of the approach that connect directly to advance the core educational areas and build capacity to improve student learning and achievement for all students in the districts. The Consortium provides a clear matrix that shows the links and phase-in timing for each component.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium identifies all schools in both districts to participate in the initiative. It notes that the recently granted State waiver, allowing greater flexibility in meeting federal performance requirements, does not diminish the strong focus both LEAs have on closing achievement gaps in area of core academic areas and increasing the four-year graduation rates.

QVEC lists the five schools (an elementary and a junior/senior high school in one district, and an elementary, a middle and a high school in the second district) have an enrollment of 2,145 students, with 40% coming from low-income families and 28 percent designated as high need. The initiative will have 172 participating educators and 25 para-educators. The approach suggests but does not specifically indicate that all enrolled students would be considered participating students.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The QVEC has identified all schools in each district as participating schools. The Consortium describes a clear plan to infuse the initiative in the participating districts through its educators. The project describes increased student-focused professional development to personalize learning, teaching and assessment; content-specific professional development; and the new work of Professional Learning Communities, and Summer Institutes. QVEC explains how these efforts will increase the presence and availability of well prepared and effective educators, and increase the modeling of effective practices in support of student learning and achievement. Project lessons and activities will reach beyond QVEC to other local districts and regionally through the Summer Institute.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium (QVEC) shows improved student learning, performance and equity resulting from the grant. The QVEC presents achievable and modest goals of 1% to 2% year over year from baseline for improved student proficiency in English/Language Arts and Math, and 2.5% for ELA growth. Similar goals using the same breakout are presented for achievement gap reduction and increased graduation rates.

College enrollment rate goals are not provided. The Consortium provides these data in aggregate for the Consortium, not for each LEA as required, and neglects to note that some subgroups may not be reflected because of their small representation in the school population.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Each LEA in the QVEC (North Brookfield Public Schools and Palmer Public Schools) shows a clear record of success in improving student outcome, closing achievement gaps and increasing high school graduation rates and college enrollment between 2009 and 2012.

- The percentage of North Brookfield students scoring proficient or higher in English/Language Arts increased from 58% to 68%, and students in the Palmer district increased from 41% to 53%. North Brookfield also showed increases in Math from 42% to 48%.
- Each district has reduced achievement gaps in particular areas, and North Brookfield's graduation rate and college enrollment rose appreciably in years since 2007. QVEC projects provides goal projections for continued success in required areas with the exception of college enrollment where no projects or explanation is provided except for college enrollment.

Neither district has low-performing schools but the LEAs have shown that "student performance in both districts is significantly below the performance of the highest-performing districts in the State." Student data in the application show as well the lower performance baselines of subgroups (students from low-income families, students designated high needs, and students with disabilities). In the North Brookfield LEA this is currently addressed by restructuring schedules to offer additional Math instruction, and supporting a Morning Academy using Title 1 funds. The Morning Academy will expand into the Palmer Public Schools.

Each LEA's uses a different information but comparable information system, and makes data available to students, educators, and parents. Students and parents have access to their information in real time and receive communication in a variety of ways. Local measures have addressed setting individual growth goals for students determined to be at risk, to monitor progress, and to structure interventions.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The QVEC Consortium demonstrates a high level of transparency. Both LEAs make public "all information, by school and by district, concerning actual school-level expenditures" for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support and school administration. The application supports the required data collection and publishing.

The information is contained in the Annual Town Report for each town that is made available to the general public. Annual budget hearings are open to the public. Each LEA also has a website posting information on non-personnel expenditures as part of the budget process. All district expenditures are filed with the State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education using Civil Rights Data Collection guidelines.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Each LEA in the Consortium has by its experience in improving student outcome demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State requirements to implement the proposed Project PRIME.

Each LEA is an autonomous school district operating under the governance of a local School Committee by authority in State law. The Consortium provides a clear picture of the State requirements that affect crafting and implementing programs, such as minimum amount of structured learning time, minimum number of school days, core subject requirements and the like. The Consortium further provides detailed information on these considerations, provides school examples of structuring activities appropriately, and provides assurance that the proposed effort will abide by the rules.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium describes wide stakeholder engagement in the genesis and formation of Project PRIME. The North Brookfield Public Schools, the LEA which led the development of the proposal, documented the history of the development and considerable stakeholder engagement. The project is rooted in the work of a North Brookfield Educational Task Force, formed in 2010 to determine a path of success for students and the town where any resident could provide input and where consensus grew that the district needed to become an "innovative center of excellence." The new superintendent met with numerous internal and external stakeholders and engaged the Palmer Public Schools, a district facing similar issues. Parents, the business community, higher education, and youth and other service organizations added their voices in support. The applicant also credits parents for providing the push and support to establish the Morning Academy. It is not clear what role stakeholders had in the development of the proposal itself.

The application includes letters of support from public and private agencies and organizations, community colleges, local business, elected leaders. Each LEA has a collective bargaining agreement and the president of each association signed the application.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

QVEC presents a clear plan for analyzing current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic

behind Project PRIME.

The Consortium examined ongoing initiatives that address components essential to implementing personalized learning environments (e.g., efforts aligning English/Language Arts and Math curricula to common core State standards, exploration of adopting different forms of instructional delivery, internal school system assessment of technology needs). The analysis identified needs and gaps and informed a baseline. Four areas were identified and form the basis of the Consortium's plan: building infrastructure and capacity, developing and aligning curricula to high standards, improving technology infrastructure (equipment and training), and improving professional development). The Consortium plan describes the activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties to address the identified needs and gaps, but does not consistently specify how they will improve personalized learning.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

QVEC provides a high-quality plan with an approach that engages all students in their own learning that will lead to improved performance and college and career readiness. The plan and implementation strategies are described clearly. The level of detail provided by component varies.

The application highlights important features to implement effective personalized student learning including plans and goals that reflect high standards, achievement based on mastery allowing students time to engage in deeper learning or explore new opportunities, increased opportunities for deeper learning in areas of interest, and age-appropriate and timely support to students (instruction and help from teachers, guidance counselors and specialists) so they can understand and navigate "multiple pathways to success."

The Consortium illustrates such opportunities with examples of having students engaged in digital learning, and students earning high school credit for successful completing dual enrollment courses, made possible through Consortium's partnerships with local community colleges. Students may deepen learning using inquiry-based learning practices (e.g., project-based learning) that will be available for students at Learning Labs located in all five school-level buildings where students will be able to receive enriched or remedial assistance. The project will provide tools and training for students to manage their own learning using technology to explore and review content and to customize and manage their plans. Access to diverse cultures is planned through international student exchange programs already existing in the North Brookfield district and being explored for the Palmer Public Schools district. Personalized learning and support are reflected across Project PRIME's components but are not consistently connected.

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium provides a high-quality approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support improved student achievement and progress toward college and career readiness.

The Consortium points out that educators, like students, benefit from personalized efforts. The project will help them develop Personal Learning Networks to learn and practice new skills. A phased-in plan for elementary teachers, for example, will help them develop skills to support personalized learning one subject at time. The project also will engage educators in subject-specific professional development in core academic areas and strengthen the use of data-driven support that will help them learn more about the student as a "whole child," a concept that underscores personalization of learning and engagement. They will also gain new skills in using technology in creating effective learning environments, adapting instructional delivery, and assisting students monitor and improve their personalized learning experiences.

The project focuses on increasing the proportion of students receiving instruction from a highly effective teacher to 34% by the end of the grant period, up from an estimated 8% now. As part of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation System, both LEAs in the Consortium will apply measures of student learning in establishing trend data that will inform the teacher professional planning and evaluation process and help determine the extent of teacher effectiveness.

Beyond the team approaches to professional development and instruction reforms that generally contribute to the school climate, no specific efforts address that component.

The Consortium provides a clear but general outline of its plan and implementation strategies with relevant activities, timelines and responsible parties.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**15**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The QVEC presents a structure that supports implementation. The Consortium consists of two separate school districts --the North Brookfield Public Schools and Palmer Public Schools. The two superintendents will serve as co-directors of Project PRIME, meeting at least weekly if not more often. Each superintendent will have responsibility for program implementation within his particular district. The districts have worked together successfully and engaged extensively in developing the project and broad support it enjoys. The Consortium of these two LEAs expresses clearly its intent to use grant funds to improve student learning and progress, not on a new structure for administration.

The Consortium governance will allow sufficient flexibility as both districts collaborate on calendars that suit their needs and meet State requirements. Each LEA under the superintendent's direction can modify the school day schedule, "allowing for matching 'math blocks' within all schools of the consortium. Capacity building, curricula, and professional development aspects of Project PRIME will be addressed on a consortium-wide basis.School personnel decisions will continue to follow the collective bargaining agreements of each LEA, with the Consortium having flexibility to share consulting staff (e.g., Math Coaches, ELA Coaches and Technology Coaches) as needed. School-level budgets remain entirely under the control of the LEA's municipality.

Students within the QVEC will be allowed to demonstrate their mastery of standard multiple times and in comparable ways and have several opportunities throughout the school year to accomplish .

The Consortium's LEAs and all schools have fully inclusive school settings providing access to all abilities of learners. Students have Individual Development Plans to ensure that teachers, parents, and students are aware of student needs and involved in creating sound approaches to meet the needs.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Current the districts' policies ensure that all students within the Consortium, regardless of income, have access to all personalized learning activities and technology during the school day. The Consortium further notes that the schools are central to community live in its small rural communities and it benefits them all there is equal access to grant activities.

The districts ensure that students, parents, educators and other stakeholders have appropriate technical support via a variety of strategies -- coaches, peer, online support, and the Consortium is exploring open data formats.

All schools in the consortium have fully aligned information systems with State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, allowing the sharing of student information data, human resources information, budget data and instructional system data.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**10**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium describes a plan developed by the LEAs to implement an effective continuous improvement process and provides a model depicting process and activities. The plan will identify challenges and remedies through the implementation process. The Project Manager will oversee this effort and guide it with the input of the Project Team. The application describes the process, but does not provide adequate specificity on activities and timing and how they might be improved with

respect to impacting student learning and achievement more effectively.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The QVEC Consortium provides a specific description and planning table for communication and engagement efforts, including targeted communications at different phases to meet the internal and external needs of the project. The Project Communication Center link on the district's websites will be updated weekly with project information, and local papers have agreed to run weekly stories. The Project Team will give regular updates to local officials. School newsletters will include monthly updates and QVEC students will be engaged with the Project Team in taping segments that will air on local cable TV. The project provides a planning schedule.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The QVEC presents 8 specific performance measures aligned to the goals of the project, with accompanying rationale and targets. The measures are relevant and appropriate but do not meet the range expected by the competition. The Consortium also does not address how measure will be reviewed and improved over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

QVEC describes plans to evaluation the effectiveness of the project and presents a data collection table (including data collection schedule, methods and instruments). The Consortium does not adequately discuss how these efforts will respond to the questions of effectiveness and impact of investments in each area and overall.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The QVEC Consortium presents an overall budget summary, budget narrative for each operating year (but not for the project overall), and detailed budgets and narratives for each component separately aligned with project goals, and appears adequate to support the development and implementation of the project.

The budget documentation identifies funds available beyond the grant. These funds come variously from local and in-kind LEA contributions and are described in the overall budget and in the component budgets. The significant one-time technology expenses are also identified.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium analyzed the projects costs and identified likely expenses to sustain the project after the grant period. The local districts' contributions are likely to continue, and the Consortium has identified the amount of funds it would need to raise from contributions and additional grants. It also has some potential resources identified, making a promising case for sustainability once programs and technology infrastructure improvements -- supported under the grant -- are made.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**10**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The QVC Consortium describes a strong and detailed plan to expand on existing partnerships with numerous public and private agencies to advance four goals:

1. Children enter kindergarten ready to succeed;

2. Students in third graders read at least at grade level;

And, in alignment with the main Project PRIME

3. Students graduate from high school on time

4.Students graduate from high school college and career ready.

The Consortium plans to expand on current and extensive partnerships with public and private agencies in the region to enhance student opportunities for learning that will provide additional support to in improving their academic performance and their college and career readiness. This priority will target resources to students facing significant challenges (students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty, family instability, or other child welfare issues). The Consortium describes plans to scale the model beyond participating students to other high-needs students and communities in the Consortium communities.

GVEC has identified relevant indicators to measure results and proposes academic and other results, to improve over time. The application provides baselines and goal targets by year for performance measures, as appropriate.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium conveys its focus on personalizing student learning and effective teaching throughout the project's various programs and supports for students, as well as sound professional development strategies that have shown to improve student achievement and students' preparedness for college and careers. The components of Project PRIME and the identified competitive priority link consistently to the core educational areas.

Total	210	170

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0764MA-3 for North Brookfield Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant has set forth a clear comprehensive and coherent reform vision that addresses the four core educational assurance areas and articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals that accelerates student achievement, deepening student learning and increasing equity through personalized learning experiences. The Quaboug Valley Educational Consortium comprises of two school districts which are closely adjacent to each other and have committed to continue their efforts towards educational personalization.

. The Applicant's proposal shows a clear and a modest approach to the targeted goals of increasing student achievement. The Consortium's common vision centers around the development of their proposal's innovative Project Prime Plan (Personalyzing Responsibility Involving My Education). The plan addresses the proposal's ambitious goals which are clear and are aligned to the four core educational assurances.

. The Applicant presented and described the proposal's Project Prime Plan overall timeline and phases of development which includes six components: 1. Project Management and Continuation of our Capacity- building Philosophy of Personalization 2. Development of ELA Currriculum Competencies 3. Development of Math Curriculum Competencies 4. Blended Learning 5. K-12 College and Career Readiness 6. Competitive Preference Priority.

. The Applicant developed a Mapping Matrix that aligns the four core educational assurances with the proposal's Project Prime Plan.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant identified the five schools that will participate in the grant program, the total number of participating students (2,145), the number of students and families from low-income families based on free and reduce lunch (40%), the percentage of enrolled high-need students (28%), and the number of educators participating in the grant activities (197).

.The Applicant's process in selecting the participating schools focused on results of their school's state and local test which reflected a need to continue the focus on closing the proficiency gaps between demographic subgroup and increasing the four year graduation rate at the high school level.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant presented a high quality plan designed to support change. Each school district will participate in the grant activities and will establish Professional Learning Communities to provide opportunities for teachers from each district to form a professional network grounded in professional development adult theory.

. The Applicant provided evidence that the proposal will be scaled by enabling participating districts to serve as demonstration sites of a Summer Institute professional development. The Summer Institutes will focus on demonstrating the proposal's program practices for both local and regional school districts.

. The Applicant provided a narrative Consortium -Wide Reform and Change Plan. that outlined the proposal's goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties which describes the proposal's plan to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools and to help the applicant reach it's outcome goals.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant describes the proposal's Performance Measures on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth) in each goal area and with each subgroup throughout and beyond the funding of the grant. The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment system will serve as the baseline for determining student achivement growth over the years of the grant's funding..

. The Applicant did not include all of the subgroups in addressing how they would reach the plan's goals.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence, according to the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System, of all participating schools significantly improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps in particular grade levels in the curriculum area of English Language Arts, Science and Technology. Charts were provided to give a visual presentation reflecting the students growth by grade level performances in Mathematices, English Language Arts and Science over the past years in grades 3,5,7,8,and 10.

. Graduation rates and college enrollment increased during the past four years in the participating school districts. During this period, the Counseling Staff at the high schools increased to give personal attention to the high school students by guiding them and their parents through the college enrollment process.

. The Appplicant provided evidence of the Consortiums' receiving grants from various agencies, businesses, foundations and colleges that have been helpful in expanding their educational programs during the past four years.

. The Applicant provided evidence that neither of the participating school's districts have low achieving or low performing schools, however it is noted that the school's districts are significantly below the performance of the highest performing districts throughout the state.Student achievement data shows that the participating schools have already accomplished advancing student learning and increasing equity of achievement.

. The Applicant provided evidence of how student performance data will be made available to students and parents by the use of their Financial Management Information System. The system allows the districts to personalized their data and student information system for students, educators and parents to inform and improve participation, instruction and services.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant has provided evidence for increasing transparency in the school's districts practices, processes and investments. The participating school districts make public all information to the participating schools and their districts regarding the actual school level expenditures for K-12 instruction and pupil and school administration support.

. The Applicant provided sufficent evidence of the extent it has already made available to participating school's level expenditures of actual personnel salaries of instructional staff, school level teachers, and non-personnel staff. Both school district's School Committees will host annual budget hearings open to the public and a website will post information on non-personnel expenditures as part of it's annual budget presentation.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under Massachusetts legal,statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environment. Both school districts adhere to the state's guidelines regarding length of the school year, school's calendars, instructional time and the state's curriculum requirements.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence of stakeholder's participation in the development of the proposal and their committment to the goals of the proposal. Focus group discussions and meetings were extended to "neighborhood meeting" held in the homes to provide discussions and feedback in the stages of the proposal's development,

. The Applicant did not provide evidence of direct support from teachers or the support of collective bargaining representation..

. The Applicant provided letters of support from businesses, communities, local, civic ,community based organizations and institutions of higher education.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant identified the needs and gaps that the proposal will address which are: 1. The need to build additional infrastructure and leadership capacity to support major changes and efforts, 2. The need to align their curriculum with their state and national standards, 3. The need to purchase usable desktop and wireless computers to meet student demand for both Blended Learning and College and Career Readiness components in the proposal, 4. The need to improve Professional Development for increasing the Consortium's staff knowledge in basic technology and their comfort level in the use of the technology tools.

. The Applicant developed a planning table that provide analysis of the proposal's needs and gaps within their school districts. The Needs and Gaps Table outlines the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsibles parties that will address the school district's needs and gaps for providing a high quality personalized learning environment in the participating school districts.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	20

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided a high quality plan and a significant approach for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to college-and career- ready graduation requirements. The Quaboag Valley Educational Consortium will adopt their state's MassCore Graduation requirements. Sequences of curriculum content and skill development will be personalized so students will be able to achieve their individualized learning goals and graduate on time. Independent programs of study aligned to the State's Common Core Standards will be provided to high school students and the partnerships's two community colleges to enable students to earn high school credit for completing duel enrollment courses.

. The Applicant provided an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students which will enable them to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college and career ready graduation requirements. High qualified guidence counselors will be provided to enable students to be engaged in planning, monitoring and understanding their academic progress. The counselors will meet regularly with students in scheduled advisory periods for students to receive and review information about their progress toward individual goals and objectives toward their college-career ready standards. The counselors will also provide support to students with economic needs and/or disabilities and/or language learing needs,

. The Applicant developed a Learning Plan that identifies the proposal's goals, activities, timelines,deliverables and responsible parties to ensure students are on track toward meeting college and career graduation requirements and to assist students develop their personalized learning plans.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	20

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence of a high qualified plan for improving learning and teaching by increasing educator's effectiveness in developing a personalized approach to professional development which will focus on new learning and teaching strategies.

. The Applicant provided evidence of the support of personalized learning environments and the strategies that students need by: 1. Providing training to educators to help them develop their own Personal Learning Networks 2. Implementing the newly Massachuesett's Educator Evaluation System by administering Consortium Determine Measures of student learning and

growth whose data will span between 2012 to 2015. 3, Implementing Massachusetts Tiered System of Support which is a data-driven student support model that addresses the proposal's goals of identifying student performance measures and monitors student progress,

. The Applicant projected goals of increasing teachers and principals effectiveness by the end of the grant funding which will focus percentages of participating students taught by highly effective teachers (34%),and percentages of participating students in a school led by a highly effective principals(25%) In order to achieve these goals participating schools will prioritize students who score below proficient and below the 50% student growth percentile for intervention each year.

. The Applicant provided a Professional Calendar with achievable timelines in developing the four phases of the proposal's Professional Development Plan.Educator's academic subjects and targeted groups were identified in the Professional Development Calendar.

. The Applicant provided a Teaching and Learning Narrative Plan which identifies the proposal's achievable goals, activitivies , timelines, deliverables and responsible parties for implementing a personalized approach for all partcipating educators in their professional development. Professional Teams will be developed to support effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet student's academic needs and ensure students are college and career ready and graduate on time

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence of a high quality plan to support the proposal's implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provides every student and educator an education system witch support resources needed.

. The Applicant' adquately describes the Consortium Goverance Structure. The Educational Consortium will govern the two school districts which consist of it's own superintendent, central office, staff and local school committees. Each superintendent will be responsible for overseeing the proposal's programs and the three newly hired Curriculum Coaches will oversee the curricular aspects of the program.

. The Applicant provided evidence of the proposal's flexibilty and autononmy over the school's schedules, calendars, personnel decision, staffing models, responsibilities for educators and non-educators and school level budgets. A recommended budget will be developed as a consortium and presented to both school's communities but the local budget will be voted independently.

. The Applicant provided evidence of students having opportunities to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Both school districts will continue giving students opportunities to demonstrate mastery which includes various strategies such Student Exhibitions and Student- Led Conferences.

The Applicant did not specicically address how the learning resources and instructional practices will be adaptable and fully accessible to Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners

. The Applicant provided evidence of a high quality plan by developing a Planning Table which identifys the proposal's goals, activities, timelines,deliverables,and responsible parties that addresses the school district's practices, polices, and rules that facilitate personalized learning.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence to support student learning by ensuring that students, educators , parents and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support, content and other learning resources through a range of strategies

at the participating school's district, however the plan does not provide sufficient evidence of creating access to their port systems which enables all stakeholders to have technical support.

. The Applicant provided evidence of strategies for using technology systems that allows parents and students to export their information in an open data format and with online support. Both school districts will offer online support to parents, staff and students by providing them access to their IPASS data system. Students without computers at home will be able to access their information using EdLine System at each school's community public library with a password provided. Parents will have access through the Department of Education My Data program to review their child's electronic academic records and performance data by 2017

. The Applicant provided evidence of the school district's use of interoperable data systems throughout the grant funding. This system is currently allowing the two school districts to share human resource data, student information data, budget data data regading instructional improvement.

. The Applicant developed a Planning Table which identifies the proposal's goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties that addresses the LEA's Infrastructure.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

.

The Applicant has developed a high quality plan with a strategy for implementing a rigorous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward the proposal's goals for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. A Continuous Improvement Process chart was created to identify challenges throughout the proposal's implementation and identifies strategies to remediate those challenges quickly and successfully. The Project Manager will oversee the implementation of all aspects of the proposal.

. The Applicant provided evidence that weekly, bi-weekly, monthly and annual meetings will be held to provide timely feedback on programming and on-going corrections and improvements.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence of implementing strategies for on-going communication and engagement with all stakeholders (internal and external). Vertical and Horizontal meetings will be held weekly, district websites will be updated with weekly information, local newspapers will run stories about all areas of the proposal and school newsletters will include monthly updates. The Project Team will give monthly updates to local town officials, fianance committees and a thirty minute tape will be provided in conjunction with high school students on local cable TV.

. The Applicant provided a Planning Table that identifies the proposal's goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties addressing implementing strategies for onging communication and engagement,

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided achievable performance measures by subgroup, with annual targets for required and proposed performance measures. The Applicant's provided a chart reflecting a rationale for selecting the performance measure, a theory of action regarding the proposal's implementation successes or concerns and how the measures will be reviewed and improved over time if it is insufficent to guage implementation progress.

	Available	Score
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

.The Applicant provided evidence of how the effectiveness of the proposal will be evaluated in order to improve results. The Evaluation Plan is aligned to the proposal's goals, objectives and performative measures.

. The Applicant provided a Data Collection Table that identifies all aspects of the comprehensive evaluation process.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided a reasonable and highly cost effect budget by outlining the sources of revenue for the proposal's programs.

. The Applicant provided a detailed cost breakdown for all expeditures for the proposal's four year funding. The Applicant use of a cost-effictive approach for implementating the proposal in addressing personalized learning environments is reasonable in relation to the proposal's objectives, design and sustainability.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence that the proposal will be sustained and scaled up by expanding professional development comprehensive training for all school districts within the Quaboag Valley Educational Consortium and reducing the proposal's positions to include reliance on the two participating school's districts staffs,, and also in publicizing the proposal's successes by press releases. National funding for traveling to conferences will be limited.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided evidence of implementing sustainable partnerships with parents, families and communities.
Plans for the Consortium are to expand their current partnerships with outside public and private agencies in addressing the social, emotional and behavioral needs of the participating students. Larger numbers of at-risk families will have access to the community school's vital services and will have help in preparing their youngest children to enter Kindergarten ready to succeed.

. The Applicant provided evidence of meeting the Competitive Priority goals by creating a Mentoring Program and a program designed to develop high school students business skills of young entrepreneurs. A Civic Engagement Plan will be developed for students in grades 9-12 that allows students to develop college and career ready skills. Students with disabilities and students of low-soco-economic status will be given highest priorty in addressing the goals of the proposal.

. The Applicant provided evidence achievable Performance Measures for implementing the proposal's programs and outlined an Overall Budget Summary Narrative with detailed and justified proposal cost for implementing the proposal's programs.

. The Applicant provided evidence of continuing to improve the results of the program with interaction and feedback and analyzing data both formative and summative. Partnering agencies will have access to all professional developments sessions and will work to identify and inventory the needs and assesses of the two school district's and their communities.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The plan shows evidence of how the participating schools will build on the core educational assurance areas to improve learning and teaching through personalization of strategies, tools, support of students and educators and the alignment with college-carrer ready standards and graduation requirements. The plan addresses accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing the effectiveness of educators. The plan showed evidence of steps to decrease the achievement gaps across student groups and in increasing rates at which students graduates from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	200